

REMARKS

This communication is in response to the Office Action mailed June 28, 2006. The Office Action reports that claims 1, 15 and 29 are continued to be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albayrak et al. in view of White et al. In particular Albayrak et al. are cited for disclosing the inventions recited in claims 1, 15 and 29 except for the features "each of the controls having an attribute to indicate whether the associated control is available for activation" and "as a function of which controls are activated." White et al were cited as evidence that these features were well known.

With respect to Albayrak et al., the Office Action again cites col. 3, lines 51-55 as disclosing "a set of controls for defining a dialog and used to dynamically generate client side markup in accordance with the dialog." The Office Action provides in depth reasoning for this assertion. Applicants will address each of them below. Moreover though, Applicants have amended each of the independent claims in a manner as explained below to patentably distinguish the present invention from the cited combination.

On page 3, the Office Action reports in the second paragraph that "controls for defining dialog" are broad terms that are disclosed by Albayrak et al, which are provided in the detailed claim rejection, and accordingly will also be discussed below. However, at this paragraph, the Office Action also reports that "...both graphic browser and voice browser necessarily or inherently include a variety of controls such as star[t]ing, interrupting, switching and ending interactive sessions (dialogs) ..., which was well known in the art." The Office Action also cites Albayrak et al. at col. 4, lines 16-19, that a voice browser is similar to a graphical browser. Applicants believe that the functions or capabilities of voice browsers and graphical browsers

are being misapplied to the independent claims. Specifically, the "set of controls" as recited in the claims is not used by the client device where such browsers are located, but rather by a server, where the set of controls are used to generate the client side markup that in turn is used by the client browser. Each of the independent claims has been amended to clarify this aspect, which should remove any misinterpretation.

In the specific rejection of the independent claims beginning on page 4 and continuing on page 5, the Office Action reports that Albayrak et al. at col. 3, lines 51-55 and at col. 4, lines 24-28 disclose the "set of controls for defining a dialog and used to dynamically generate client side markup." Although Albayrak et al. discuss managing voice dialog at col. 3, lines 51-55, they do not teach or suggest "a set of controls configured for use on a server remote from the client for defining a dialog and used to dynamically generate client side markup" and where the controls are specifically enumerated as an answer control and question control as recited in each of the independent claims. As explained above, and clarified by the amendment made in each of the independent claims, the set of controls are operable on the server to dynamically create the client side markup in accordance with such controls. The citation at col. 3, lines 51-55 simply does not teach this specific technique. Furthermore, the citation at col. 4, lines 24-28 which states,

VoiceXML was designed by the VoiceXML Forum to create audio dialogs that feature digitized audio and speech recognition and to facilitate web-based development and content delivery. The voice browser reads a VoiceXML page from top to bottom and acts upon the information and instructions it reads as it reads them

simply describes how the client side markup works. Applicants do not disagree that this is how a browser interpreting client side markup works, but rather, that this description does not teach or suggest a set of controls that operate on the server to generate

the client side markup in a manner as recited by each of the independent claims.

Further on page 5, the Office Action makes reference to other instances pertaining to VoiceXML or the voice browser such as at col. 4, lines 22-67 and col. 3 lines 6-64, but again this description pertains to how the voice browser interprets the client side markup, but not how the client side markup is dynamically generated at the server using the controls specified in the independent claims.

With this Amendment claim 26 has been cancelled and claim 32 has been added.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application as amended. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the pending claims is solicited.

Applicant hereby requests an extension of time to respond to the Office Action. A charge authorization for the extension of time fee is included herewith.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Steven M. Koehler, Reg. No. 36,188  
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

SMK:dkm